

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 08/470,571 | HARVEY ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |

PETER-ANTHONY PAPPAS
2628

All Participants:

(1) PETER-ANTHONY PAPPAS.

Status of Application: Pending

(3) Carl L. Benson.

(2) Thomas J. Scott, Jr.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 28 January 2010

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

80

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Peter-Anthony Pappas/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2628

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

The examiner stated that the administrative requirement set forth by the examiner in the Ex parte Quayle action mailed on 11/03/09 is hereby withdrawn as the examiner has independently conducted a double patenting analysis of the claims in the instant application. An examiner's amendment to place the instant application into conditions for allowance was proposed and agreed upon.